UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/661,696	09/12/2003	David D. Brandt	03AB014C/ALBRP303USC	7375
Susan M. Donahue Rockwell Automation, 704-P, IP Department 1201 South 2nd Street Milwaukee, WI 53204			EXAMINER	
			BAUM, RONALD	
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			2439	
			MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
			11/17/2010	PAPER

## Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

	Application No.	Applicant(s)
Examiner-Initiated Interview Summary	10/661,696	BRANDT ET AL.
Examiner initiated interview duminary	Examiner	Art Unit
	RONALD BAUM	2439
All Participants:	Status of Application:	_
(1) <u>RONALD BAUM</u> .	(3)	
(2) <u>BRIAN STEED</u> .	(4)	
Date of Interview: 8 November 2010	Time: <u>13:30</u>	
Type of Interview:  ☐ Telephonic ☐ Video Conference ☐ Personal (Copy given to: ☐ Applicant ☐ Applic  Exhibit Shown or Demonstrated: ☐ Yes ☐ No If Yes, provide a brief description:	cant's representative)	
Part I.		
Rejection(s) discussed: n/a		
Claims discussed: 1		
Prior art documents discussed: n/a		
Part II.		
SUBSTANCE OF INTERVIEW DESCRIBING THE GEN	ERAL NATURE OF WHAT WAS	DISCUSSED:
Part III.		
<ul> <li>It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate directly resulted in the allowance of the application. Tof the interview in the Notice of Allowability.</li> <li>It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate did not result in resolution of all issues. A brief summand</li> </ul>	he examiner will provide a writte record of the substance of the	en summary of the substance interview, since the interview
/Ronald Baum/ Examiner, Art Unit 2439	(Applicant/Applicant's Representat	ive Signature – if appropriate)

Continuation of Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was discussed: Discussed with applicant's representative - Mr. Steed - that the aspects of the claim(s) missing in order to move prosecution forward deal with the need to have the claims explicitly target the claimed invention to the industrial controller network environment. More succinctly, a security network management system/software embodiment that CAN BE USED IN AN INDUSTRIAL CONTROL environment per se, - given the security limitations as presently claimed - is not patently distinct, such that: (1) the present preamble elements of claim 1, as applied as claim limitations and, (2) aspects of the industrial control protocols detailed in the pending disclosure are needed to be integrated into the pending claims to forward prosecution. The applicant will propose claim language to be considered in potential amending of claims.